

CACoP Forum meeting 51

1 December 2023, 10:00 – 11:20

Teleconference

Minutes

Attendee	Representing
David Kemp (DK)	Forum Chair
Rachel Black (RB)	Forum Secretary
Ivar Macsween (IM)	BSC
Patrick Matthewson (PM)	BSC
Teri Puddefoot (TP)	CUSC, Grid Code, STC
Christopher McCann (CM)	DCode
Dylan Townsend (DT)	DCUSA
Colette Baldwin (CB)	REC
Elizabeth Woods (EW)	SEC
Helen Bennett (HB)	UNC
Puja Vadgama (PV)	Ofgem
Nadia Hall (NH)	Ofgem

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting.

The Chair noted apologies from Milly Lewis, Isaac Moore and Yvonne Reid-Healy.

1. ACTIONS UPDATE

Ref	Action	Discussion	Outcome
50/01	The Chair to speak to the UNC about appointing a representative to the FSO CCP CCWG	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed
50/02	The Chair to advise the Forum on the expected upcoming costs for the CACoP website	The Forum noted the update and agreed to close the action.	Closed

The Forum **NOTED** the updates and **AGREED** the actions marked 'Propose to Close' could be closed.

2. WORK PLAN UPDATE

The Chair presented the Work Plan update and shared the latest progress on items. The Chair reminded members that feedback on all areas mentioned was welcomed.

The Forum **REVIEWED** the progress of items on the work plan and **AGREED** the schedule and next steps for work items.

3. CACoP SURVEY RESPONSES AND NEXT STEPS

The Chair took the Forum through the responses received to the CACoP survey, noting that only one response had been received.

The Forum discussed the comments received on the proposed changes to the CACoP document. DT considered the response indicated that there should be a push for the Proposer to have more responsibility for providing the consumer and net zero benefits. CB believed that this assumed the Proposer engages with the Code Administrator before raising the modification, which is often not the case. They believed that the proposal form templates should be reviewed to bring this into focus. The Chair considered the proposed wording of the new Principle would support greater input from the Proposer and suggested that each Code reviews their forms separately to make this section clearer. The Forum agreed with this approach.

DT noted that there are differences in the way some Codes operate, for example the DCUSA Panel does not make recommendations or have the same discussions as outlined in Principle 15. The Chair acknowledged this and advised that the wording in the CACoP needs to be generic enough so that it can be adapted by each Code, and that this wording was already used throughout the document.

IM considered that the low response rate to the survey makes it challenging to innovate and ensure the Forum is making the best use of its time. They asked if Ofgem has any view on the low response rate. PV advised they will discuss this with their colleagues and provide feedback for the Forum. The Chair acknowledged the low response rate but added that modification consultations often have similar issues. They noted that many organisations do not have the resources to respond to all consultations, and that this survey may have been seen as a low priority for Code users to respond to. CB wondered whether the low engagement rate was due to the industry not considering there to be any issues with the CACoP or the Forum.

CB queried if there were any other ways the Forum should try and gain feedback. They suggested Code Administrators could ask for slots at their respective Panel meetings to discuss the CACoP and gain feedback. DT highlighted that the DCUSA Panel already receives CACoP updates via a paper prepared after each Forum meeting with any points to note. CM suggested Code Administrators could engage with their Panels earlier in the year to gain feedback. The Chair agreed with the proposal that Code Administrators could seek time at their Panel meetings to discuss the CACoP. They proposed that each Code Administrator should take this forward in a way that works best with their Panel.

PV asked if the Forum had run these surveys before. The Chair advised this is the first survey to be issued for several years. They considered whether engaging with the Panels prior to issuing the survey may have improved the response rate and noted this as a lesson learnt for any future Forum consultations.

The Chair recommended closing work item 007 on the work plan, as there appeared to be no further changes to the website needed at this time. The Forum agreed with this. Work item 005 will also be closed once Ofgem's decision on the proposed changes to the CACoP has been received. The Forum agreed there were no further work items to raise following this survey.

The Forum:

- **NOTED** the responses received to the CACoP survey;
- **AGREED** the proposed changes to the CACoP document should be recommended to Ofgem; and
- **AGREED** there were no further work items arising from this work to add to the work plan.

4. JANUARY 2024 CACOP NEWSLETTER

The Chair asked the Forum if there were any items members wanted to include in the January 2024 edition of the CACoP Newsletter.

The Chair believed an introduction from the new Chair (TP) should be included. They also plan to include a look back over the last year and will be drafting an end-of-year report to go on the CACoP website. The Forum raised no further items at this time. The Chair requested that any items be notified to Gemserv by the end of December 2023.

The Forum **NOTED** the update.

5. STC CHAIRING THE CACOP FORUM IN 2024

TP introduced themselves to the Forum as the new CACoP Forum Chair, ahead of the STC's turn chairing the CACoP Forum in 2024. TP advised they are open to comments and suggestions from the Forum as they move forward.

The Chair asked the Forum to approve the proposed 2024 meeting dates, proposing to continue the current pattern of the first Friday of every second month starting at 10:00.

TP queried if it is worth having a meeting in August 2024, noting that meetings often slow down during the summer holidays. HB suggested this could be considered at the June 2024 meeting.

DT asked if the meeting days could return to Tuesdays, as they no longer work Fridays, though they will still be able to attend the meetings if they did remain on Fridays. PV advised that they do not work Tuesdays. The Chair noted that, due to Panel and other meetings, the only alternative days with availability had been Mondays and Fridays. TP suggested the Forum could schedule the

meetings for the first half of the year on Fridays, and the meetings for the second half of the year on Mondays.

The Chair proposed the Forum agreed to the proposed dates for now and revisit them in February once members have checked their diaries. TP agreed with that approach and that this can be discussed at the February 2024 meeting.

ACTION 51/01: Members to consider any viable alternative Forum meeting dates for discussion at the February 2024 meeting.

The Chair also asked members to notify them of any changes they would like to make to the Forum mailing list before this is handed over to NGESO.

The Forum **NOTED** the update and **AGREED** the 2024 Forum meeting dates.

6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

CB queried if the Data Integration Platform (DIP) should be considered as an additional Code with its own governance arrangements, making it separate to BSC. This had been discussed in the Cross Code Steering Group (CCSG), where it had been advised that the DIP has a level of separation from Elexon. They suggested the DIP be considered for inclusion as a Forum member next year.

DT considered that the DIP is more a Central Service System Provider than a Code Administrator. They also noted that the CACoP Principles will not be applicable to the DIP unless it had an appropriate governance framework put in place. They acknowledged that the Forum might want to engage with the DIP in the future, but queried if they should be formally included. IM agreed that it is worth considering. The Chair agreed that this is something to consider but noted that the CACoP Forum was originally set up as a discussion forum for the Code Administrators of the Codes bound by the CACoP.

The Chair proposed that reviewing the Forum membership be added as a work item and discussed as part of the next meeting. The Forum agreed with this approach.

PV advised that Ofgem will not be carrying out a cross-Code survey in 2024. They also noted Ofgem is considering implementing a similar mechanism for Code Managers in the future. In the meantime, they proposed that Code Administrators could carry out their own surveys, with the Forum agreeing more consistent questions that could be asked through these. They also suggested this could be included as a new CACoP Principle in the future.

DT advised that the DCUSA would have no issues with this, but noted ElectraLink's customer satisfaction survey covers different parts of the business beyond just the DCUSA. They also queried how this would interact with other surveys and how they would be timed to run side-by-side. CB noted that RECCo and the REC carry out regular surveys. They were concerned there could be too many surveys in circulation at the same time. They asked if Ofgem has a timeline for when it would want each Code to send out surveys. PV advised they will obtain further details for the Forum. The Chair proposed to add this as a work item to be discussed in the next meeting, and that members should consider this within their organisations ahead of this.

ACTION 51/02: Ofgem to provide more details and a timeline for its proposed Code Administrator-led surveys approach.

ACTION 51/03: Members to consider the proposed Code Administrator-led surveys approach and any common questions for inclusion for discussion at the February 2024 meeting.

PV reminded the Forum of Ofgem's publishing moratorium from 14 December 2023 to 4 January 2024.

PV advised that the Future System Operator (FSO) Cross Code Workgroup (CCWG) has made good progress, and there is ongoing work for the gas packages. Ofgem will be meeting with Code Administrator representatives shortly to discuss this. They stated that the FSO project plan aims to begin baselining changes across all the affected Codes in the first quarter of 2024. DT asked when these will go live. PV was unsure but agreed to find out and inform the Forum; however, DT advised they would raise this during the next CCWG meeting instead. They are comfortable with baselining the proposal but would find it useful to know when it might be implemented. The Chair proposed an update could be given at the next meeting.

The Chair reminded the Forum that the 2024 Panel and Modification meeting dates should now be posted on the CACoP website.

ACTION 51/04: Code Administrators to add their 2024 Panel and Modification meetings to the CACoP website calendar.

SUMMARY AND MEETING CLOSE

The next CACoP Forum meeting will be held on Friday 2 February 2024.

The Chair thanked everyone for attending and inputting to the discussions and closed the meeting.